

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 23 2005

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace Figs. 18 and 19 with the attached drawings. Label 109 of Fig. 18 and label 116 of Fig. 19 have been amended to read "DATA DEMODULATOR".

Attachments: "Replacement Sheet" for each of Figs. 18-19 and corresponding annotated drawings.

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed September 23, 2004 has been received and carefully noted.

The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

A "Petition for Extension of Time" for extending the due date for responding to the Office Action by two months and a credit card payment form to cover the fee payment (\$450.00) for the extension are filed with this Amendment. Authorization is granted to charge counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing **Attorney Docket No. 024016-00008**, for any additional fees necessary for entry of this Amendment.

Claims 1-7 and 9-15 have been amended, claim 8 has been canceled, and dependent claim 17 has been added. No additional claim fee is believed to be necessary for this additional claim. The Specification and Figs. 18-19 have been amended. Applicant submits that the amendments made herein are fully supported in the Specification and the drawings, as originally filed, and therefore no new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, claims 1-7 and 9-17 are pending in the present application.

The drawings stand objected to for an informality. Figs. 18-19 have been amended in response to the Examiner's objection, and it is submitted that the drawings, as amended, comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.184(e). The objections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Dependent claim 8 stands objected to as being of improper dependent form. Specifically, the Examiner noted that claim 8 is the same as dependent claim 6. Claim 8 has been canceled, and thus the objection with respect to this claim is now moot. The objection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 10-11 and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner noted that there was insufficient antecedent basis in the claim language of the rejected claims. Claims 1, 10-11 and 13-14 have been amended in response to the Examiner's objection. It is submitted that claims 1, 10-11 and 13-14, as amended, comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112. The rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Dependent claims 2-7 and 9 depend from independent claim 1, and dependent claims 12-15 depend from independent claim 11. These dependent claims have been amended in view of the amendments to claims 1 and 11 mentioned above. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Park patent (U.S. Patent No. 5,631,783). Claim 8 has been canceled, and thus the rejection with respect to this claim is moot. Dependent claims 2-7 and 9 and dependent claims 12-16 depend from independent claims 1 and 11, respectively. The rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a data processor comprising a receiving unit for receiving a series of data including a predetermined mark for detecting synchronization and generating a plurality of parallel data from the series of data; and a plurality of detecting units for detecting the predetermined mark for detecting synchronization from the plurality of parallel data. Independent claim 10, as amended, recites a data processor for detecting the predetermined marks for detecting synchronization included in a series of data read from a memory medium in order to establish synchronization at a time of transferring the series of data to a controller unit from a read channel unit, comprising similar features. Independent claim 11, as amended, recites

a data processing method of the same. It is respectfully submitted that the Park patent does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the data processor or method of the present invention.

With reference to Fig. 8, the Park patent appears to disclose a "wedge identification" ("WID") reader of a magnetic disc apparatus employing constant-density recording, comprising, in part, serial parallel converter 30 for synchronizing read data RDATA from encoder/decoder (ENDEC) 18 with read clock signal RCLK and converting the read data RDATA into parallel data by the byte; an address mark detector 32 for detecting the WID of the data sectors of the magnetic disc; a counter 34 for counting the pulse of the read clock signal; a decoder 36 for decoding the output count data of the counter; and a register 38 for storing the WID. (col. 7, l. 33 - col. 8, l. 4) It is respectfully submitted that the Park patent does not disclose or suggest the data processors and method, as claimed in the present invention.

Specifically, the address mark detector 32 of the Park patent is neither equivalent nor analogous to the detecting units of the present invention, as suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action. Rather, the Park patent merely discloses a single synchronization mark detecting means, namely, an address mark detector 32 for comparing the parallel data converted with a predetermined ID address mark to detect the WID of the data sectors of the magnetic disc. In contrast, the present invention discloses, in pertinent part, a plurality of detecting units for detecting a predetermined mark for detecting synchronization from a plurality of parallel data. The plurality of synchronization mark detecting units perform data parallel processing, and thus data processing with a reduced frequency can be achieved, which makes it possible to provide power saving. Accordingly, the Park patent fails to disclose or suggest the data processors and method, as claimed.

Based upon the forgoing, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every element recited within independent claims 1 and 10-11 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Park patent, and therefore is patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is requested.

It is further submitted that dependent claims 2-7 and 9 and dependent claims 12-16 are also patentable and in condition for allowance due to their dependency upon independent claims 1 and 11, respectively, since the dependent claims differ in scope from the corresponding parent claims. Dependent claims 2-7 and 9 depend from independent claim 1 and dependent claims 12-16 depend from independent claim 11, and thus are further limited to additional features of the invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are patentable over the Park patent for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 11. Reconsideration is requested.


New dependent claim 17 recites a data processor according to claim 1, wherein the plurality of detecting units detect the corresponding each of the plurality of parallel data. It is submitted that support for dependent claim 17 is found in the Specification of the present invention, for example, at p. 14, ls. 1-18. It is also submitted that claim 17 is patentable and in condition for allowance due to its dependency upon independent claim 1, since the dependent claim is limited to additional features of the present invention. Entry of this new claim is respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicant's undersigned

counsel at the telephone number, indicated below, to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

Dated: February 23, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Marylee Jenkins
Registration No. 37,645
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX, PLLC
1675 Broadway
New York, New York 10019
Tel: (212) 484-3928
Fax: (212) 484-3990

MLJ/my